REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action mailed on December 2, 2003. Claims 1-11 were examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rigole.

Claims 1, 3-17 remain pending in the Application after entry of this response. Claims 1, 3, and 7-10 have been amended and claims 12-17 have been added. No new matter has been added by the amendments or new claims. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to speak to Applicant's representative by telephone on March 29, 2004 to clarify the discrepancy between the Examiner's indication of non-final status on the summary page of the Office Action dated December 2, 2003 and of final status in paragraph 3 of the same. In the conversation, the Examiner clarified that the Office Action dated December 2, 2003 is non-final.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Rigole. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent that the rejection might apply to amended claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites a wavelength-tunable laser, wherein "the difference between any two adjacent reflected optical frequencies is constant and the reflected optical frequencies are interleaved with consecutive optical frequencies of resonant modes." By contrast, Rigole provides little, if any, disclosure on the specifics of actually tuning the laser. (See e.g., Rigole, p. 5, lines 21-p. 8, line 32.) For this reason, Rigole fails to teach each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Therefore, amended

claim 1 is patentable over Rigole. Claims 3-11 are also patentable over Rigole since they depend from allowable, amended claim 1.

Regarding new claims 12-17, Rigole does not disclose a wavelength-tunable laser or a method of manufacturing a reflector for a laser, "wherein each sample of the first and second Bragg gratings, with the possible exception of a first or a last sample of the Bragg gratings, is disposed on the reflector in a repeated pattern comprising one sample of the first Bragg gratings, a first sample of a plurality of third gratings, one sample of the second Bragg gratings, and a second sample of the third gratings," as recited in claims 12 and 15, respectively. Again, Rigole provides little or no disclosure on the specific structure of reflector 13. (See, e.g., Rigole, p. 5, lines 24-30; p. 7, lines 5-19; and p. 7, lines 31-34-pg. 8, lines 1-6.) For this reason, Rigole fails to teach each and every limitation of claims 12 and 15 and therefore cannot anticipate either of these claims. Claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Rigole since they depend from allowable claim 12, and claims 16 and 17 are also patentable over Rigole since they depend from allowable claim 15.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, Applicant believes that he has overcome all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed December 2, 2003, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Carey
Registration No. 51,530
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500
Houston, Texas 77056-6582
Telephone: (650) 330-2310
Facsimile: (650) 330-2314